



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

less real even than the *homo oeconomicus* of the classic economists," But this contention needs much more proof than is vouchsafed in this small monograph.

The articles of C. Henry and the "Note" of E. Waxweiler are mathematical studies of the sociological problem of the measurement of the intellectual and "energetic" capacities of a given collectivity. The three papers of Henry treat respectively of "the criterium of ir. reducibility of statistical *ensembles*," "The decomposition of pseudobinomial curves into binomial curves," and "cotes et mesures." Dr. E. Houzé, the author of the monograph on "The Aryan and Anthropo-sociology," is Professor of Anthropology at the University of Brussels, and his aim is to show that the "so-called Aryan" is "not a primitive people, but an invention of the study-room," and that "anthropo-sociology" and its alleged "laws" are based on "fundamental errors, statistical, anatomical, physiological, psychological and historical." In the first part of his study Professor Houzé discusses the "Aryan" from the linguistic, historical, archæological and anthropological points of view, reaching the conclusion that, after all "there is no *Aryan* question," and that it is absurd to recognize among the various peoples of Europe "one human type superior to all others and the factor in all civilizations." The morphological Aryan does not exist; never has existed; and archæologic search for him is utterly vain. Aryan linguistics is a deceitful thing and has been responsible for many vagaries of "science." Europe has been the scene of the development of interesting forms of human culture, but their inspiration has not been chiefly "Aryan" nor Asiatic. The second part of the monograph is devoted to "anthropology," and in it the author points out that just as all civilizations have been produced by peoples and not by special types, the value of intelligence can never be revealed by examinations of human skulls;—all theories seeking to make psycho-physiological deductions from craniometry are necessarily false. The "pseudo-anthropology" of Lapouge and his school receives special attention in the third section, on "anthropo-sociology," which is styled a futile attempt to mix two distinct sciences. This book is interesting reading for those among ourselves who have added to the "Aryan" by imagining an "Anglo-Saxon" as the goal of his complete development. One is as non-existent as the other, if we believe Houzé.

ALEXANDER F. CHAMBERLAIN.

L'Aggrandissement et la Proximité Apparentes de la Lune à L'Horizon.
Ed. Claparède. Archives de Psychologie, 1906, V, 121-146.

Preliminary to presenting his own views Claparède reviews previous theories put forward to account for the fact that the moon appears larger at the horizon than at the zenith.

The theories he discusses and puts aside as false or inadequate are refraction, pupillary dilation, fall of the crystalline lens, comparison, contrast, direction of the glance, overestimation of angles, weakness of peripheral vision, further distance at horizon. The last theory seems to him the most tenable and he explains it in some detail. It depends on the well established law of vision that for a given retinal image the object corresponding to that image seems larger where it is judged more distant. The moon is judged further away at the horizon and hence is seen larger. But against this, Claparède brings forward a series of experiments made by himself, and others by Zoth, showing that to 120 out of 125 persons the moon appears not further away at the horizon but much nearer.

In order to hold the classic explanation and at the same time account for the fact as established by Claparède's experiments that the

moon at the horizon appears nearer, we must suppose that two contradictory judgments can take place in the same mind at the same time:—first, the moon at the horizon is more distant and therefore is seen larger, and second, the moon is larger and therefore nearer.

By means of an experiment with stereoscopic images obtained by convergence and divergence, Claparède found that the image of divergence which is judged further away and therefore seen larger, at times appeared nearer than the image of convergence, thus proving the possibility of two contradictory judgments taking place at the same time.

But even though this be so, the hypothesis seems improbable and Claparède is led to look for the cause of the illusion in another sphere, in the region of affection rather than of mere perception. Our affective attitude in perceiving the moon at the horizon differs from that in perceiving the moon at the zenith. In the first case we regard the moon as a terrestrial object either because it is not at first recognized or because it is in the terrestrial zone. Now objects in the terrestrial zone interest us more than objects in the sky. This change in importance we translate into a change in size. Because the moon attracts more attention at the horizon, we see it larger.

To establish this factor, Claparède experimented with a picture in which two moons appear, one at the horizon, the other at the zenith, and caused each to disappear in turn by means of a small black disk put over it. Fourteen out of twenty persons who observed the picture got the illusion of the moon at the horizon as larger. Here neither distance, form of the sky, direction of the glance could play the least rôle. The affective factor must have been the only one operative to cause the illusion.

But fourteen affirmative judgments out of twenty is not sufficient to establish any conclusion. The outcome of the paper has been simply to leave the problem richer by two unproved hypotheses.

Bryn Mawr College.

V. ROBINSON.

Die Schätzung von Bewegungsgrößen bei Voderarmbewegungen. ROSWELL P. ANGIER. *Zeits. f. Psy.*, 1905, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 429-447.

The movements studied were of the elbow joint only, with the arm moving horizontally. The movements compared were always in the same direction and between objective limits. The distances varied between 9.2 cm. and 10.8 cm. with one of the two distances compared always 10 cm. Angier was the only subject. Several series of experiments were made (always with closed eyes) to test the influence on the discrimination sensibility of differences in rapidity, in resistance, in position of the starting points of the movements compared and also to compare the precision of judgment in active and in passive movements.

His results are summarized as follows: The precision with which length of movement is estimated (at least in the case of the experimenter) is affected neither by resistance nor by change in the position of the arm (provided new muscles be not brought into play), nor yet by the passivity of the movement. A constant error is, however, introduced when the velocity of the comparison movement is made greater than that of the standard. In that case, the comparison movement is overestimated in 92% of the wrong judgments. For passive movements the proportion rises to 94%. In these comparisons the standard movement was made at a rate called 'natural' by the author.

The conclusions of previous experimenters agree with these, or at least do not contradict them, with regard to resistance, position and passivity. On the question of velocity, however, Delabarre and Loeb